



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable John Barrasso
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Barrasso:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nancy K. Stoner', with a stylized, looping flourish at the end.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Ron Johnson
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Johnson:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nancy K. Stoner', with a stylized, looping flourish at the end.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable John Thune
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Thune:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a 'K' and a large, loopy flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Tim Scott
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Scott:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Pat Roberts
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Roberts:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a 'K' and a cursive 'S'.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Jerry Moran
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Moran:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nancy K. Stoner', with a stylized, cursive flourish at the end.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Mike Lee
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Lee:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Roger F. Wicker
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Wicker:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Jeff Sessions
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Sessions:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Marco Rubio
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Rubio:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Lisa Murkowski
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Murkowski:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable John S. McCain
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator McCain:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Mike Johanns
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Johanns:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nancy K. Stoner', with a stylized, cursive flourish at the end.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Johnny Isakson
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Isakson:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable John Hoeven
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Hoeven:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a cross-like symbol and a cursive flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Orrin G. Hatch
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Hatch:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Deb Fischer
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Fischer:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Mike Crapo
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Crapo:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Thad Cochran
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Cochran:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nancy K. Stoner', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Daniel Coats
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Coats:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable James M. Inhofe
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Inhofe:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Dean Heller
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Heller:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nancy K. Stoner', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Chuck Grassley
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Grassley:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nancy K. Stoner', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Michael B. Enzi
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Enzi:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable John Cornym
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Cornym:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Tom Coburn
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Coburn:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Saxby Chambliss
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Chambliss:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable John Boozman
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Boozman:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nancy K. Stoner', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable David Vitter
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Vitter:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 19 2013

OFFICE OF WATER

The Honorable Roy Blunt
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Blunt:

Thank you for your April 23, 2013, letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Acting Administrator Bob Perciasepe expressing your concern regarding potential issuance of the EPA and the Department of the Army (Army) guidance clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction. I understand your interest in this important issue.

There is an urgent need to clarify the geographic scope of protections provided under the CWA. The EPA and Army issued joint guidance in 2008 to provide consistent procedures for identifying jurisdictional waters under their regulations after the Supreme Court decisions of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. The 2008 guidance, however, has created uncertainty, raised costs, and contributed to delays for those asking whether or not particular waters are covered by the CWA. In response to these problems, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed new guidance as a timely interim step to address the need for improved procedures. Our long-term goal is to revise our regulations to provide a more comprehensive and effective solution under the Administrative Procedures Act and consistent with the CWA and Supreme Court decisions. The agencies' guidance is now undergoing interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget. In the meantime, we are also working to prepare a joint notice of proposed rulemaking for public notice and comment. No final decisions have been made on the schedule for either issuance of final guidance or initiation of a notice and comment rulemaking process.

The agencies share your perspective regarding the importance of waters of the United States' rulemaking and agree that such rulemaking may not extend jurisdiction beyond that established by Congress under the law as clarified by Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. As you correctly point out, not all waterbodies are subject to protection under the CWA. We believe, however, that the 2008 guidance is unnecessarily vague and confusing, creating avoidable problems in the process of identifying which waters are covered by the CWA. We are eager to respond to these problems in a timely, scientifically valid, and transparent process under the law.

We are pleased that the courts have consistently upheld the agencies' decisions regarding the scope of CWA jurisdiction and it is our intent to continue to implement our responsibilities in a fair, scientifically appropriate, and legally defensible manner. I would emphasize that neither of the court decisions identified in your letter, *Sackett* and *Virginia Department of Transportation*, involved a challenge to an EPA determination regarding the geographic scope of CWA protections.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may call Denis Borum in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-4836.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a series of loops and a final flourish.

Nancy K. Stoner
Acting Assistant Administrator